



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/765,621	01/22/2001	Hideya Takeo	Q61229	8760

7590 09/20/2006
SUGHRUE, MION, ZINN, MACPEAK & SEAS, PLLC
2100 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20037-3202

EXAMINER

KIM, CHONG R

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2624

DATE MAILED: 09/20/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/765,621	TAKEO, HIDEYA	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Charles Kim	2624	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 June 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-39 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,7,11,12,17,21-31,33,35,38 and 39 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 3-6,8-10,13-16,18-20,32,34,36 and 37 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 22 January 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment and Arguments

1. Applicant's amendment filed on June 29, 2006 has been entered and made of record.
2. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered, but they are not deemed to be persuasive for at least the following reasons.

In response to the objection to the amendment filed October 4, 2005, applicants argue (page 16) that "the specification was merely amended to more literally describe claims 7 and 17" and "therefore, the disclosure supports the specification modification." The examiner would like to point out that claims 7 and 17 have been amended and as a result, differ in scope from claims 7 and 17 filed originally. As explained in the office action dated August 20, 2004, applicant's amendment to claims 7 and 17 were not found to be supported by the original disclosure. Accordingly, the applicant's amendment to the specification to "more literally describe" amended claims 7 and 17 are also not supported by the original disclosure.

Applicants further argue (page 16) that the 112 first paragraph rejections should be withdrawn in view of the amendments made to claims 7 and 17. The examiner disagrees. Amended claims 7 and 17 recite, in part, "wherein said reduction comprising reducing a spatial frequency component corresponding to a grid array frequency of each possible stationary grid that may be used." The examiner notes that even as amended, claims 7 and 17 are not supported by the applicant's original specification. The examiner was unable to find any instances in the applicant's specification that mentions reducing spatial frequency components of a plurality of stationary grids--spatial frequency components of each possible stationary grid that may be used.

Applicants further argue (page 18) that their claimed invention (claim 1) differs from the prior art because “Ohta is not concerned with reducing a transformed image signal in the vicinity of an array direction of a periodic pattern. Consequently, modifying Ohta to include the teachings of Yazici would result in a substantial modification of the principal operation of Ohta.” The examiner disagrees. Although Ohta may not be concerned specifically with reducing a transformed image signal in only the vicinity of an array direction of a periodic pattern (thus, the 103 rejection), Ohta *is* concerned with reducing a transformed image signal of a periodic pattern and improving the accuracy of the pattern suppression method (Ohta, col. 8, lines 56-59). Similarly, Yazici is also concerned with reducing a transformed image signal of a periodic pattern (Yazici, abstract) and provides a technique for improving the accuracy of the pattern suppression method by performing the reducing step in only the vicinity of an array direction of the periodic pattern, and not reducing any of the transformed image signals in a different direction from the vicinity of the array direction of the periodic pattern (col. 3, lines 50-col. 4, line 2 and figures 7-8). Thus, modifying Ohta to include the teachings of Yazici would not result in a “substantial modification,” as applicants contend, because both Ohta and Yazici are concerned with suppressing a periodic pattern in an image by applying frequency transformations. Moreover, Yazici’s teaching provides a solution that meets Ohta’s objective of improving the accuracy of the pattern suppression method.

Specification

3. The amendment filed October 4, 2005 is objected to under 35 U.S.C. 132(a) because it introduces new matter into the disclosure. 35 U.S.C. 132(a) states that no amendment shall

Art Unit: 2624

introduce new matter into the disclosure of the invention. The added material which is not supported by the original disclosure is as follows: The newly added material on pages 2-3 of the amendments to the specification are not supported by the *original* disclosure.

Applicant is required to cancel the new matter in the reply to this Office Action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

4. Claims 7, 17, 38-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Referring to claim 7, the phrase “wherein said reduction comprises reducing a spatial frequency component corresponding to a grid array frequency of each possible stationary grid that may be used” is not sufficiently described in the applicant’s specification. The Examiner was unable to find an instance in the applicant’s specification that provides support for reducing spatial frequency components of a plurality of stationary grids--spatial frequency components of each possible stationary grid that may be used. Similar rejections are applicable to claims 17, 38-39.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1, 2, 11, 12, 21, 24, 27, 28, 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Ohta, U.S. Patent No. 5,173,788 (“Ohta”) and Yazici et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,333,990 (“Yazici”).

Referring to claim 1, Ohta discloses a periodic-pattern suppression method of reducing a spatial frequency component which forms a periodic pattern (contained in an original image signal, the method comprising the steps of:

- a. transforming the original image signal, represented in a real space domain, into a plurality of transformed image signals which can be handled in a frequency domain (col. 2, lines 44-58), and
- b. reducing a transformed image signal of the transformed image signals which has a desired frequency range containing a spatial frequency component corresponding to at least a frequency of the periodic pattern (col. 2, lines 58-68), and then transforming the transformed image signals into an inverse-transformed signal in the real space domain (col. 3, lines 1-12).

Ohta does not explicitly disclose that the reducing is performing in only the vicinity of an array direction of the periodic pattern, and not reducing any of the transformed image signals in a different direction from the vicinity of the array direction of the periodic pattern. However, this

feature was exceedingly well known in the art. For example, Yazici discloses a periodic-pattern suppression method that reduces a transformed image signal which has a desired frequency range containing a spatial frequency component corresponding to at least a frequency of the periodic pattern in only the vicinity of an array direction of the periodic pattern, not reducing any of the transformed image signals in a different direction from the vicinity of the array direction of the periodic pattern [col. 3, line 50-col. 4, line 2 and figures 7-8. Note that the reduced “grid line spectral component” (380) is in the vicinity of an array direction of the periodic pattern, since the grid line spectral component constitutes the periodic pattern].

Ohta and Yazici are combinable because they are both concerned with suppressing a periodic-pattern in an image by applying frequency transformations. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the reducing step of Ohta so that the transformed image signal corresponding to the periodic pattern is reduced in only the vicinity of an array direction of the pattern, as taught by Yazici. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to reduce the periodic pattern without reducing resolution and blurring the image, thereby enhancing the accuracy of the pattern suppression method (Ohta, col. 8, lines 56-59). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Ohta with Yazici to obtain the invention as specified in claim 1.

Referring to claim 2, Ohta discloses a periodic-pattern suppression method of reducing a spatial frequency component resulting from a periodic pattern, contained in an original image signal, the method comprising the steps of:

- a. transforming the original image signal, represented in a real space domain, into a plurality of transformed image signals which can be handled in a frequency domain (col. 2, lines 44-58), and
- b. reducing a transformed image signal of the transformed image signals which has a desired frequency range containing a spatial frequency component corresponding to at least a array frequency of the pattern (col. 2, lines 58-68), and then transforming the transformed image signals into an inverse-transformed signal in the real space domain (col. 3, lines 1-12).

Ohta does not explicitly disclose that the periodic pattern comprises a stationary grid contained in an original image signal photographed using the stationary grid and that the reducing is performing in only the vicinity of an grid array direction of the stationary grid. However, this feature was exceedingly well known in the art. For example, Yazici discloses a periodic-pattern that comprises a stationary grid contained in an original image signal photographed using the stationary grid and a reducing step that reduces a transformed image signal which has a desired frequency range containing a spatial frequency component corresponding to at least a grid array frequency of the stationary grid, which is actually used, in only the vicinity of an array direction of the stationary grid, not reducing any of the transformed image signals in a different direction from the vicinity of the array direction of the periodic pattern [col. 2, lines 58-67, col. 3, line 50-col. 4, line 2, and figures 7-8. Note that the reduced “grid line spectral component” (380) is in the vicinity of the grid array direction of the stationary grid, since the grid line spectral component constitutes the stationary grid].

Ohta and Yazici are combinable because they are both concerned with suppressing a periodic-pattern in an image by applying frequency transformations. At the time of the

Art Unit: 2624

invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of Ohta in view of Yazici. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to reduce the periodic pattern without reducing resolution and blurring the image, while enabling a variety of different periodic patterns to be suppressed, thereby enhancing the flexibility and accuracy of the periodic pattern suppression method (Ohta, col. 8, lines 56-59). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Ohta with Yazici to obtain the invention as specified in claim 2.

Referring to claim 11, see the rejection of at least claim 1 above.

Referring to claim 12, see the rejection of at least claim 2 above.

Referring to claim 21, Ohta discloses a periodic-pattern suppression method of reducing a spatial frequency component resulting from a periodic pattern, contained in an original image signal, the method comprising the steps of:

- a. transforming the original image signal, represented in a real space domain, into a plurality of transformed image signals which can be handled in a frequency domain (col. 2, lines 44-58), and
- b. reducing a transformed image signal of the transformed image signals which has a desired frequency range containing a spatial frequency component corresponding to at least a frequency of the pattern having a low range end and a high range end (col. 2, lines 58-68 and col. 4, lines 20-64).

Ohta does not explicitly disclose that the periodic pattern comprises a stationary grid contained in an original image signal photographed using the stationary grid and that the reducing is performing in only the vicinity of an grid array direction of the stationary grid,

Art Unit: 2624

wherein the frequency components greater than the high end range are not suppressed and lower than the low end range are not suppressed by filtering. However, this feature was exceedingly well known in the art. For example, Yazici discloses a periodic-pattern that comprises a stationary grid contained in an original image signal photographed using the stationary grid and a reducing step that reduces a transformed image signal which has a desired frequency range containing a spatial frequency component corresponding to at least a grid array frequency of the stationary grid having a low range end and a high range end in only the vicinity of an array direction of the stationary grid, wherein frequency components greater than the high end range are not suppressed and lower than the low end range are not suppressed by filtering [col. 2, lines 58-67, col. 3, line 50-col. 4, line 2, and figures 7-8. Note that the reduced “grid line spectral component” (380) is in the vicinity of the grid array direction of the stationary grid, since the grid line spectral component constitutes the stationary grid].

Ohta and Yazici are combinable because they are both concerned with suppressing a periodic-pattern in an image by applying frequency transformations. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of Ohta in view of Yazici. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to reduce the periodic pattern without reducing resolution and blurring the image, while enabling a variety of different periodic patterns to be suppressed, thereby enhancing the flexibility and accuracy of the periodic pattern suppression method (Ohta, col. 8, lines 56-59). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Ohta with Yazici to obtain the invention as specified in claim 21.

Referring to claim 24, see the rejection of at least claim 21 above.

Referring to claim 27, Yazici further discloses that the reducing step reduces the transformed image signals of the transformed image signals which has a desired frequency range (390) containing a spatial frequency component corresponding to at least a grid array frequency (380) of each possible stationary grid that may be used in only the vicinity of a grid array direction of each stationary grid (figures 7-8. Note that the grid array frequency 380 is not a set value, but is the value of each possible stationary grid that may be used).

Referring to claim 28, see the rejection of at least claim 27 above.

Referring to claim 31, Ohta further discloses that the original image signal comprises a complete original photographed image (col. 3, lines 29-33).

6. Claims 22-23, 25-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Ohta, U.S. Patent No. 5,173,788 ("Ohta"), Yazici et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,333,990 ("Yazici"), and Hara, U.S. Patent No. 6,173,086 ("Hara").

Referring to claim 22, Ohta and Yazici do not explicitly disclose that the stationary grid is a vertical grid and the transformed image signals comprise frequency components of a two-dimensional wavelet transformation, the transformed image signals being subjected to a one dimensional transformation in the vertical scanning direction. However, this feature was exceedingly well known in the art. For example, Hara discloses a stationary grid that is a vertical grid (col. 2, lines 58-63 and figure 2) and the transformed image signals comprise frequency components of a two-dimensional wavelet transformation, the transformed image signals being subjected to a one dimensional transformation in the vertical scanning direction (col. 5, lines 49-65).

Ohta, Yazici, and Hara are combinable because they are all concerned with suppressing a periodic-pattern in an image by applying frequency transformations. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of Ohta and Yazici in view of Hara. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to provide a high quality periodic pattern reduced image and enhance the flexibility of the periodic pattern suppression process (Hara, col. 3, lines 34-56). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Ohta and Yazici with Hara to obtain the invention as specified in claim 22.

Referring to claim 23, Ohta and Yazici do not explicitly disclose that the stationary grid is a horizontal grid and the transformed image signals comprise frequency components of a two-dimensional wavelet transform, the transformed image signals being subjected to one dimensional wavelet transformation in the horizontal scanning direction. However, this feature was exceedingly well known in the art. For example, Hara discloses a stationary grid that is a horizontal grid (col. 2, lines 58-63) and the transformed image signals comprise frequency components of a two-dimensional wavelet transform, the transformed image signals being subjected to one dimensional wavelet transformation in the horizontal scanning direction (col. 5, lines 49-65).

Ohta, Yazici, and Hara are combinable because they are all concerned with suppressing a periodic-pattern in an image by applying frequency transformations. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of Ohta and Yazici in view of Hara. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to provide a high quality periodic pattern reduced image and enhance the flexibility of the

Art Unit: 2624

periodic pattern suppression process (Hara, col. 3, lines 34-56). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Ohta and Yazici with Hara to obtain the invention as specified in claim 23.

Referring to claims 25-26, see the rejections of at least claims 22-23 above.

7. Claims 29-30, 33, 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Ohta, U.S. Patent No. 5,173,788 ("Ohta"), Yazici et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,333,990 ("Yazici"), and Barski et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,269,176 ("Barski").

Referring to claim 29, Ohta and Yazici do not explicitly disclose that the reducing step judges the grid array direction of the stationary grid, and applies the process of reducing a component less than a predetermined frequency, based on the result of the judgment. However, this feature was exceedingly well known in the art. For example, Barski discloses a method for reducing a grid structure in an image by reducing a component less than a predetermined frequency based on a judged grid array direction of a stationary grid (col. 5, lines 28-36 and col. 8, line 30-col. 9, line 10. Note that the kernel filters provide both high-pass and low-pass filtering, and therefore, reduce a component less than a predetermined frequency).

Ohta, Yazici, and Barski are combinable because they are all concerned with reducing a periodic pattern in an image. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the reducing step of Ohta and Yazici, so that it is based on the judged grid array direction, as taught by Barski. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to provide faster processing and the preservation of detail in the image (Barski, col. 2, lines 50-57). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Ohta and Yazici, with Barski to obtain the invention as specified in claim 29.

Referring to claim 30, see the rejection of at least claim 29 above.

Referring to claim 33, Ohta and Yazici do not explicitly disclose that the reducing step calculates powers of the plurality of transformed image signals, judges a grid length direction of the stationary grid, based on whether or not each calculated power is greater than a predetermined threshold value, and applies a process of reducing a component less than a predetermined frequency, based on the result of judgment. However, Barski discloses these features in column 5, lines 28-36 and column 6, line 59-column 7, line 41.

Ohta, Yazici, and Barski are combinable because they are all concerned with reducing a periodic pattern in an image. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the reducing step of Ohta and Yazici, so that it is based on the judged grid array direction, as taught by Barski. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to provide faster processing and the preservation of detail in the image (Barski, col. 2, lines 50-57). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Ohta and Yazici, with Barski to obtain the invention as specified in claim 33.

Referring to claim 35, see the rejection of at least claim 33 above.

Allowable Subject Matter

8. Claims 3-6, 8-10 13-16, 18-20, 32, 34, 36, 37 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Charles Kim whose telephone number is 571-272-7421. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon thru Thurs 8:30am to 6pm and alternating Fri 9:30am to 6pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jingge Wu can be reached on 571-272-7429. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-272-8300.

Art Unit: 2624

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



ck

September 11, 2006


JINGGE WU
PRIMARY EXAMINER